

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

MARIE COSGROVE, )  
                          )  
Plaintiff,            )  
                          )       No. 3:12-cv-412  
vs.                    )  
                          )  
IC SYSTEM, INC.,      )       **JURY DEMAND ENDORSED HEREON**  
                          )  
Defendant.            )

**COMPLAINT**

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, MARIE COSGROVE, by and through her attorneys, LUXENBURG & LEVIN, LLC, and for her Complaint against the Defendant, IC SYSTEM, INC., Plaintiff alleges and states as follows:

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

1.     This is an action for damages for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (hereinafter the “FDCPA”), 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*, and the Ohio Consumer Sales Practices Act (hereinafter the “OCSPA”), Ohio Rev. Code § 1345.01, *et seq.*

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2.     Jurisdiction arises under the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*   Venue lies properly in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), as a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the claim occurred within this District.

**PARTIES**

3.     Plaintiff is an individual who was at all relevant times residing in Washington Township, Ohio.

4. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3), as she is a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a debt.

5. At all relevant times, Defendant acted as a “debt collector” within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), in that it held itself out to be a company collecting a consumer debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff.

6. The aforementioned alleged debt is a “debt” within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5), in that it is an alleged obligation of Plaintiff to pay money arising out of a transaction in which the money, property, insurance and/or services which are the subject of the transaction were primarily for personal, family and/or household purposes.

7. On information and belief, Defendant is a corporation of the State of Minnesota, which is licensed to do business in Ohio and which has its principal place of business in St. Paul, Minnesota.

### **COUNT I**

(Violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act)

8. Defendant, through its agents, representatives and/or employees, began contacting Plaintiff during or about the calendar year of 2012 in attempts to collect the aforementioned alleged debt, but failed to identify themselves as debt collectors during each and every communication with Plaintiff.

9. During or about the calendar year of 2012, Defendant reported two separate tradelines on Plaintiff’s credit reports, and has since failed to report that these alleged debts are disputed. The tradelines were related to medical services rendered by a pediatrician’s office in Florida, a state Plaintiff’s child has never been treated in.

10. Plaintiff has contacted Defendant by telephone and by mail, but Defendant has refused to provide further information about the alleged debt.

11. Defendant failed to send Plaintiff notice regarding the alleged debt, as required by 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a).

12. In its attempts to collect the aforementioned alleged debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:

- a. Communicating credit information which was known or which should have been known to be false, including failing to communicate that the alleged debt was disputed, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(8);
- b. Failing to disclose in every communication with Plaintiff that the communication was from a debt collector, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11);
- c. Failing to provide the notice to Plaintiff which is required by 15 U.S.C. § 1692g; and
- d. By acting in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failing to comply with the FDCPA.

13. As a result of Defendant's violations as aforesaid, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer personal humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, MARIE COSGROVE, respectfully prays for a judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation of the FDCPA;

- b. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff; and
- c. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

**COUNT II**

(Violation of the Ohio Consumer Sales Practices Act)

14. Plaintiff hereby adopts, re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations set forth above as though fully rewritten here.

15. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt from Plaintiff as described above constitute a "consumer transaction" as defined in Ohio Rev. Code § 1345.01(A).

16. Defendant is a "supplier" as defined in Ohio Rev. Code § 1345.01(D), as Defendant is in the business of effecting or soliciting consumer transactions.

17. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined in Ohio Rev. Code § 1345.01(C), as he is a person who engaged in a consumer transaction with a supplier, the Defendant herein.

18. Defendant's actions and omissions described above constitute unfair, deceptive and unconscionable acts and practices, in violation of Ohio Rev. Code §§ 1345.02 and 1345.03, and the substantive rules promulgated under the OCSPA.

19. Defendant, through its agents and employees, knowingly committed the unfair, deceptive and unconscionable acts and practices described above.

20. As a result of Defendant's unfair, deceptive and unconscionable acts and practices, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, various damages which include, but are not limited to the categories of damages described above.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, MARIE COSGROVE, respectfully prays for a judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. Statutory damages of \$200.00 for each violation of the OCSPA;
- b. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff; and
- c. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

**JURY DEMAND**

Pursuant to Civil Rule 38, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues in this action, except for any issues relating to the amount of attorneys' fees and litigation costs to be awarded should Plaintiff prevail on any of her claims in this action.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Mitchel E. Luxenburg  
Mitchel E. Luxenburg (0071239)  
David B. Levin (0059340)  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Luxenburg & Levin, LLC  
23875 Commerce Park, Suite 105  
Beachwood, OH 44122  
(888) 493-0770, ext. 301 (phone)  
(866) 551-7791 (facsimile)  
Mitch@LuxenburgLevin.com